

1 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
2 HALE AND DORR LLP
3 Sonal N. Mehta (SBN 222086)
4 sonal.mehta@wilmerhale.com
5 2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
6 Palo Alto, CA 94306
7 Tel.: (650) 600-5051
8 Fax: (650) 858-6100

6 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
7 HALE AND DORR LLP
8 Joshua A. Vittor (SBN 326221)
9 joshua.vittor@wilmerhale.com
10 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2400
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071 USA
12 Tel.: (213) 443-5300
13 Fax: (213) 443-5400

11 *Attorneys for Defendant*
12 *Apple Inc.*

13
14
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 SAN JOSE DIVISION
18

19 FRANCESCO CORALLO

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 NSO GROUP TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,
23 Q CYBER TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED, and
24 APPLE INC.

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-05229-RS

**DECLARATION OF JOSHUA A.
VITTOR**

**DECLARATION OF JOSHUA A. VITTOR IN SUPPORT OF APPLE MOTION FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF**

I, Joshua A. Vittor, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, located at 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California, 90071. I am licensed to practice law in the State of California and am counsel of record in this litigation for Defendant Apple, Inc (“Apple”). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and with the proceedings in this case, and if called to testify as a witness thereto, I would do so competently under oath.

2. On September 23, 2022, Plaintiff Francesco Corallo (“Plaintiff”) filed this lawsuit against the following Defendants: NSO Group Technologies Limited and Q Cyber Technologies Limited (collectively, the “NSO Defendants”), and Apple.

3. Plaintiff served Apple with the Complaint on September 23, 2022. To my knowledge, Plaintiff has not yet served the NSO Defendants with the Complaint.

4. On October 4, 2022, and October 7, 2022, I contacted counsel to ask about the status of Plaintiff’s effort to serve the NSO Defendants. I noted that Apple anticipated the Court would expect the parties to work collaboratively to follow a uniform schedule for responding to the Complaint, applicable to all defendants, so as to avoid inconsistent deadlines. Counsel for Plaintiff represented that it had not been successful in serving NSO Defendants with the Complaint, but agreed to a three-week extension.

5. On October 14, 2022, I again contacted counsel for Plaintiff to follow up on Apple’s request about the status of service on the NSO Defendants, and to reiterate Apple’s position that, if Plaintiff was having trouble effectuating service, the parties should stipulate to extend and/or stay the deadline to respond to the Complaint until such service on the NSO Defendants was completed. On October 17, 2022, counsel for Plaintiff (1) refused to stipulate to stay Apple’s complaint response deadline pending service on the NSO Defendants, and (2) confirmed that Plaintiff had not yet served the NSO Defendants with the Complaint.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
2 foregoing is true and correct.

3 Executed in California on October 24, 2022.

4
5 /s/ 
6 Joshua A. Vittor
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28